

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----	x	
	:	
BEN GYADU,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil No. 3:02CV01271 (AWT)
	:	
MAURA O'CONNELL,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	
-----	x	

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT

The Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 57) was granted pursuant to the court's Endorsement Order (Doc. No. 118) accepting Magistrate Judge Martinez' recommended ruling (Doc. No. 113). The plaintiff untimely filed an objection to the recommended ruling (see Plaintiff's Objection to Recommended Ruling (Doc. No. 120)), which the court did not review before conducting its *de novo* review with respect to the recommended ruling on the motion for summary judgment.

On April 6, 2006, the pro se plaintiff filed a "Motion to Open and Amend Judgement [sic] Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Procedure 59(e)" (Doc. No. 122). The plaintiff seeks to have the court vacate its order accepting the recommended ruling and ordering the entry of summary judgment in favor of the defendant. In deference to the plaintiff's pro se status, all of the documents filed by him in connection with his objection to the entry of summary judgment in favor of the defendant have been reviewed by the court. Those documents are as follows: (i) Plaintiff's Objection to Recommended

Ruling (Doc. No. 120); (ii) Motion to Open and Amend Judgement [sic] Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Procedure 59(e) (Doc. No. 122); (iii) Plaintiff's Request to Supplement Motion to Open (Doc. No. 126/128); and (iv) Plaintiff's Objection to Defendant's Opposition to Motion to Open (Doc. No. 129).

After considering the arguments made by the plaintiff in the papers filed since the court's review of the recommended ruling, the court concludes that, as to the substance of the motion for summary judgment, the plaintiff merely repeats arguments that were considered and found by the court to lack merit upon its initial *de novo* review of the recommended ruling and the papers filed in connection with the motion for summary judgment. Thus, after such consideration, the court continues to be of the view that the recommended ruling on the defendant's motion for summary judgment should have been accepted and the defendant's motion for summary judgment should have been granted.

For the reasons set forth above, the plaintiff's "Motion to Open and Amend Judgement [sic] Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Procedure 59(e)" (Doc. No. 122), wherein he seeks relief from the judgment entered in this case, is hereby DENIED.

It is so ordered.

Dated this 25th day of May, 2006, at Hartford, Connecticut.

/s/Alvin W. Thompson

Alvin W. Thompson
United States District Judge